

## **REMARKS**

Claims 13, 22-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hedrick et al. (US 6,368,216 B1) in view of Tarantino (US 6,656,047 B1).

Regarding the analogous art; Hedrick discloses a system of linked gaming machines connected to a progressive and tournament system; Tarantino discloses a system of linked gaming machines that facilitates connection to a progressive display and machines links for tournament play. Both inventions are related to gaming machine casino networks and tournament play.

Regarding claim 13; Hedrick discloses a gaming machine system comprising: at least two gaming machines linked together, said gaming machines linked to an interactive sign; said interactive sign comprising an LCD screen; said LCD screen displaying a bonusing event that players can enter in, wherein players playing said linked gaming machines who enter said bonusing event compete against each other on said interactive sign, (8:15-39), machines link together, (8:56-63), LCD screen, (16:40-44), tournaments. Hedrick is silent to the tournament being conducted with linked machines and although it is well-known in the art; Tarantino discloses gaming machines linked though a network to conduct player tournaments and progressive play, (abstract). It would have been obvious to use the already existing machine network link to facilitate a progressive link and player tournaments as taught by Tarantino in order to account for everyone's play during the tournaments.

Hedrick does not teach that persons compete against each other on an interactive sign. Further, Hedrick does not teach that the machines are linked together. The Examiner cites to Col. 8, lines 15-39 to show that players play against each other. This section relates to Fig. 5. Fig. 5 specifically relates to remote programming of the games and has nothing to do with two persons competing against each other. There is no language in this section with regards to competition between two persons on an interactive sign. The section describes a tracking device generating game outcomes and a netplex protocol. None of these have anything to do with two players competing on an interactive sign. Further, the secondary games described in Cols. 19-23 all have to do with individual play. None of these secondary games relate to any competition between players whatsoever. The Examiner cannot point to any of this being taught by Hedrick and therefore, Claim 13 should be allowed over the prior art.

Regarding claim 22; Hedrick discloses a wherein said interactive sign comprises an LCD screen where a player enters bonus play and competition is between a player playing said gaming machine and said bonusing event on said interactive sign, (16:36-44).

The sections cited by the Examiner relates to communicating with casino attends and scheduling activities with a spouse. This is nothing to do with what is taught in Claim 22.

For these reasons and the reasons stated above for Claim 13, Claim 22 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding claim 23; Hedrick discloses a system for alerting a player when they are playing on said interactive sign, (4:6-14), casino service notification.

Casino service notification which is pointed out by the Examiner relates to speaking to someone in the casino about something. This has nothing to do with alerting a player when they are playing on the interactive sign.

For this reason and the reasons stated above for Claim 13, Claim 23 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding claim 24; Hedrick discloses wherein a player operates said bonusing event from any of said gaming machines linked to said interactive sign, (16:40-44).

For the reasons stated above for Claim 13, Claim 24 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding claim 25; Hedrick discloses wherein said bonusing event comprises a wheel which has various monetary denominations, (2:29-31).

Claim 25 requires a wheel which have various monetary denominations. The Examiner has pointed to a section which discusses how secondary information can be provided in a gaming machine with regards to utility meters and the section states that wheels or other simple mechanical indicators can be used. This has absolutely nothing to do with Claim 25, which relates to a wheel having various monetary denominations as a bonusing event.

For this reason and the reasons stated above for Claim 13, Claim 25 is not anticipated or obvious over Hedrick.

Regarding claim 27; Hedrick discloses wherein said bonusing event comprises a Ferris wheel that unloads coins when one of said linked gaming machines triggers said bonusing event, (23:27-47), the use of wheels as bonus instruments are disclosed and variations of them are a simple design choice.

For the reasons stated above for Claim 13, Claim 27 is not anticipated or obvious over Hedrick.

Claim 26 is rejected as being obvious over Hedrick and Tarantino as applied above and in view of Dote (US 5,221,083).

Regarding claim 26, Hedrick and Tarantino combination discloses all the features of claim 13 including the bonusing event played on the LCD display, but fails to mention a one on one game with a dealer. Dote discloses wherein a player plays one on one with a casino dealer on said LCD screen, (fig. 2). It would have been obvious to create a linked blackjack tournament showing the dealer to make the game more attractive. The display of the one on one player vs. dealer game would have been a predictable result of displaying the last player standing on a Black Jack tournament.

For the reasons stated above for Claim 13, Claim 27 is not anticipated or obvious over Hedrick.

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EM 388041822 US  
Date of Deposit: December 21, 2009  
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith  
is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail  
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the  
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner  
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on  
December 21, 2009

Signature:

Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss

Reg. No. 34,751

Attorney for Applicant

Weiss & Weiss

300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251

Mineola, NY 11501

(516) 739-1500